

STATE OF MAINE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 97-580 (II)

October 29, 1999

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Investigation of Central MainePower
Company's Revenue Requirements
and Rate Design (Phase II)

ORDER DENYING
MOTION IN LIMINE

WELCH, Chairman; NUGENT and DIAMOND, Commissioners

I. BACKGROUND

On March 19, 1999, the Commission issued its decision in Phase I of this docket. In its Order, the Commission noted:

Due to the complexity of the issues in this matter and the need to commence this proceeding two and one-half years prior to the start of the rate effective year, the parties, as well as the Examiners, have been aware very early on of the need for an update phase as part of this case.

On May 3, 1999, the Hearing Examiner issued a Procedural Order which initiated the Phase II proceeding. That Procedural Order set forth the issues which had been identified in the Phase I Order to be addressed during the Phase II proceeding. The parties were provided an opportunity to submit corrections or additions which they believed should be made to the initial list of issues. CMP filed its list of issues on May 11, 1999.

On May 13, 1999, a case conference was held on this matter. At that time, the Examiner noted two areas of concern with the list filed by CMP. The first was CMP's proposal to revise its cost separation study due to its decision to eliminate MainePower. The second area of concern was the Company's proposal to update its attrition study in specific areas where it believed the overall inflation factor was inadequate. The Examiner suggested that it might be possible, and more efficient, to address whether these issues should be in or out of the Phase II case prior to the Company's filing of its direct case. The Examiner asked for comments on this proposal, and both the OPA and the Company submitted comments. CMP in its comments argued that it would be unfair to "cherry pick" the issues to be litigated based on CMP's filing of a comprehensive list of issues. Any decision to preclude issues should await CMP's filing of its direct case. The OPA noted several areas of concern with CMP's list of issues, but the OPA did not specifically recommend a procedural vehicle for adjudicating such issues.

After reviewing the comments of the parties, the Examiner concluded that the parties should have the opportunity to fully present their direct cases on all issues they believed to be proper for Phase II. After the direct case filings were made, opposing parties would have the opportunity to object to those issues they believed went beyond the scope of the Phase II proceeding by the filing motions in limine. The schedule issued to govern Phase II established times for all parties to file such motions.

On July 1, 1999, CMP filed its Phase II direct case. On July 12, 1999, the OPA filed a motion in limine which sought to exclude the Company's testimony and exhibits on the following issues:

1. CMP's modification of its revenue/attrition adjustment to use separate inflation factors for O&M Payroll Expense and Medical Insurance Expense;
2. CMP's elimination of A&G costs allocated to MainePower without adjustment for A&G savings that will be generated by CMP's merger with Energy East; and
3. CMP's proposal to recover the costs of retiring MainePower employees as "employee transition costs" under 35-A M.R.S.A. Section 3216.

CMP filed its response to the OPA's motion on July 19, 1999.

Prior to addressing the specifics of the OPA's motion we will set out the general principles concerning updates we believe apply to this Phase II proceeding.

II. GENERAL STANDARDS GOVERNING UPDATES

The Company, in its reply to the OPA's motion in limine, argues that the Commission must, if provided with more recent, accurate information, allow the utility to update its case. Quoting *New York Telephone Co. v. PSC*, 29 N.Y.2d, 164, 324 N.Y.S. 2d 53, 272, N.E. 554 (1971), the Company argues:

The law is well-settled that the Commission may not rely on a reckoning when actual experience is available and establishes that the predictions have been substantially incorrect. . . "To prefer the forecast to the survey is an arbitrary judgment." In a recent case, *Boston Gas Co. v. Department of Public Utilities*, Mass., 269 N.E.2d 248, pp. 257-259 (1971) the court held that the Commission must consider evidence of attrition, which has actually occurred since the test period. The Massachusetts case rationale is not new . . .

Id.

We agree in general with the principle that the Commission should, where possible, rely on the best evidence available in making its decisions. The Commission has, in the past, generally provided the parties with fairly wide latitude to submit updates during the course of rate case proceedings so that the Commission would have the most up to date and reliable data in making its decisions. *Central Maine Power Company, Proposed Increase in Rates (Section 307)*, Docket No. 90-076, Order Granting and Denying Staff Motion to Strike Testimony (Dec. 26, 1990). As is clear from past decisions, however, the right to update is not without limits. *Bangor Hydro-Electric Company, Proposed Increase in Rates*, Docket No. 91-010, Procedural Order No. 12 (Sales Forecast Rebuttal Testimony) (Sept. 6, 1991). In Docket No. 90-076, the Commission noted:

While we rule that "updates" to testimony may be admissible in general, under some circumstances, upon objection, updates may not be admitted. We must consider the admissibility of particular testimony on a case-by-case basis. We must balance between the value of the new, sometimes more accurate testimony, and the extent of the burden on other parties to address it during a significantly shorter time span than is available at the outset of the case. In determining the second factor, the Commission must consider the amount of potential prejudice to a party or to the public generally.

Docket No. 90-076, Order at 4.

In deciding whether to admit updated testimony, our Hearing Examiners have also held that other factors, such as the diligence of the party in developing new evidence, the stage of the proceeding and the time and effort expended on the current evidence should also be considered. *Public Utilities Commission, Investigation Into New England Telephone Company's Cost of Service and Rate Design*, Docket No. 92-130, Procedural Order at 3 (May 5, 1993).

The Company argues that the fact that CMP's update is offered in Phase II is irrelevant. We disagree. Due to the complexity of setting rates for restructured electric utilities and the need to do a T&D revenue requirements, rate design and stranded costs investigation, or a "mega-case," for every electric utility in the State, we initiated our investigation for CMP in September 1997. Unlike a typical rate case, we have already issued a Part I decision in this proceeding. That decision was based on 88 volumes of testimonial evidence, 370 record exhibits and hundreds of pages of legal briefs. While we did not establish final rates in Phase I, it is clear that the Phase I proceeding was not merely a "dry run." In commenting on the need to do a Phase II update proceeding, we noted:

We do not, however, expect the Phase II proceeding to be a replay of this phase. We have attempted, through our decisions here, to narrow the number and scope of the issues for the Phase II proceeding.

Phase I, Order at 63.

In accordance with the preceding discussion, we will assess the merits of the OPA's motion by looking at the likely value of the updated information; the potential prejudice to the other parties and to the public interest posed by responding to the updated information in the compressed Phase II time period; the diligence of the updating party in presenting the information; the effort expended on litigating the issue in Phase I; and the extent to which the Commission has addressed and decided the issue in Phase I.

II. ISSUES RAISED BY THE OPA'S MOTION

A. Modification of Attrition Adjustment

As part of its updated case, the Company proposed a \$6,627,000 increase to test year payroll expense to recognize actual and projected cost increases through the rate year. The Company also proposed an increase of \$1,524,324 to test year medical insurance costs to recognize actual and projected increases through the rate year. A breakdown of the Company's proposals on these two revenue requirement adjustments is presented below:

Projected Salary and Wage Expense

(Thousand of \$)	1996 Actual	1997 Actual	1998 Actual	1999 Projected	2000 Projected	2001 Projected	Rate Year Projected
T&D Payroll Expense	\$50,528	\$52,951	\$53,607	\$55,215	\$56,871	\$58,578	\$57,156
Percent Change		4.8%	1.2%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	

Projected Medical Expense for Active Employees

	1996 Actual	1997 Actual	1998 Actual	1999 Projected	2000 Projected	2001 Projected	Rate Year Projected
T&D Co. Expenditure	\$4,169	\$4,351	\$4,721	\$5,146	\$5,609	\$6,114	\$5,694
Percent Change		2.4%	12.2%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	

In its motion in limine, the OPA argues that in the Phase I proceeding, the Company, all other parties, and the Commission adopted, as a starting point, the GDPPI-projected inflation factor as the inflation factor to be applied to "all other" expenses not separately analyzed. In its Phase II filing, the Company is proposing for

the first time to apply separate inflation factors to the test-year levels of (a) O&M Payroll Expense and (b) Medical Insurance Expense. The OPA argues that the Company's proposed changes in calculation represent not an "update" but rather a deviation from the methodology used by the Commission in Phase I to calculate the Company's ultimate revenue requirement.

CMP replies that since CMP had to use a 1996 test year and since more than eight months remain before rates go into effect, the Commission must consider actual post-1996 data to arrive at reasonable O&M levels for rates starting in 2000. The Company notes that the Law Court on several occasions has stated that where the Commission has actual data available to it that makes the test year calculation more accurate, the Commission must consider that data. Citing *Central Maine Power v. Public Utilities Commission*, 153 Me. 228, 136 A.2d 726 (1957), the Company argues that to ignore actual data:

is to defeat the very idea of fixing rates for the future upon intelligent and informed estimates The experience of the test year is at best a "guess" for the future. If we can make the "guess" more in line with the probability, in the long run we will have benefited both public and Company.

153 Me. at 235, 136 A.2d at 732.

Due to the Commission's need to begin this case nearly two and a half years prior to the commencement of the rate year, some of the test year data, including wages and medical expense information, is stale. The question is how can such information best be updated. The Company's update to its wage and medical insurance expense consists of both "known and measurable" changes from the test year to the present, as well as a change in the methodology for determining how such expenses are projected to increase from present through the rate year. Applying the considerations set forth above, we believe that the Company's proposed updates should be allowed to remain in the case. While the change in the inflation factor being applied to wages and medical insurance expenses does constitute a new "methodology," we do not believe that this particular change is so complex that it cannot be addressed in the context of the Phase II proceeding.

Our decision to allow the Company to update should not be viewed as a decision on the merits of whether, in calculating the attrition adjustment, a separate inflation factor can be applied to certain cost categories. While it may or may not be possible or appropriate to adopt the Company's proposed ratemaking methodology, we conclude that all interests will best be served by allowing the parties to fully litigate this issue in the context of the Phase II proceeding.

B. Transition Costs for MainePower Employees

As part of its updated case, the Company seeks to increase the amount recovered in T&D revenue requirements for severance payments made pursuant to the requirements of 35-A M.R.S.A. § 3216 related to the Company's decision to terminate MainePower and CMP Technical Services (E-PRO) employees.

The OPA argues in its motion that employees of MainePower do not constitute "eligible employees" under Section 3216(1)(A) because they are not employees of an electric utility. In addition, the OPA argues that these employees were not terminated as a result of retail access, since retail access, as that term is used in Maine's Restructuring Act, refers to competitive electricity providers offering generation services to retail customers in Maine. The decision to terminate the MainePower business unit was based on competitive forces in other states, chiefly Massachusetts, and MainePower's inability to generate earnings for CMP Group due to low standard offer prices in those states.

CMP counters that the OPA's argument on this issue goes to the merits of CMP's request rather than to whether the issue is a proper one for update. Therefore, the OPA's motion is more in the way of a motion for summary judgment than a motion in limine. According to CMP, since the facts at this point support CMP's contention that its MainePower employees are "eligible employees" as defined by 35-A M.R.S.A. § 3216, if summary judgment is granted at this time judgment should be entered in favor of CMP.

The request to include additional severance benefits relates to an event which occurred subsequent to the time of its Phase I filing. The Company has not changed its methodology as to how benefits are calculated. While there may be an issue as to whether these terminated employees were eligible for benefits under 35-A M.R.S.A. § 3216, that issue should be addressed by the Commission during the course of this proceeding. The Company's update on this issue was proper and, therefore, the OPA's motion on this issue is denied.

C. Cost Separations Update for Elimination of MainePower

In its Phase II filing, the Company updated A&G cost separations to reflect the Commission's decision in Phase I; the Company's elimination of MainePower; the removal of North Augusta Office Annex costs; and the inclusion of a portion of the energy trading and marketing costs in T&D revenue requirements.

In its motion in limine, the OPA requests that the Commission eliminate from the Phase II proceeding, CMP's revision to its cost separations study to reflect the elimination of the MainePower business operation. The OPA argues that the Company's revision to its cost study to reflect subsequent events is asymmetric since there have been two significant developments at the corporate level since the conclusion of Phase I: the closure of MainePower and CMP's merger with Energy East. While the Company has presented its case to reflect what it believes will be the

increased cost associated with the elimination of MainePower, the revised cost study totally ignores the likely decrease of CMP's A&G costs as a result of the merger.

The Company responds that there is no linkage between costs associated with the elimination of MainePower and potential merger savings. The merger agreement with Energy East provides for up to 18 months for completion of all regulatory approvals. At this point, it is not possible to know when, or even if, the merger will close. Therefore, it is simply not possible to impute any savings associated with the merger as part of this case.

In Phase I of the case, CMP's cost separation study was submitted by Company Comptroller Michael Caron and Rate Analyst Dufour (hereinafter, "Caron/Dufour"). Using test year accounting data, Caron/Dufour separated costs into five separate business groups: the holding company, the T&D utility, the wholesale and retail marketing business (MainePower), the operations support division, and the other subsidiaries. The first step in the Caron/Dufour separations process was to remove directly identifiable and assignable generation costs, stranded costs and rate proceeding "eliminations." After removing these costs, the remaining financial data were segregated into the four remaining cost categories: T&D, Wholesale and Retail, Operating Support Division and the Holding Company.

After this separation, OSD and Holding Company costs were apportioned among T&D and the wholesale and retail business units. This was accomplished when possible on a direct basis and for much of the rest on an indirect cost allocation basis. A pool of residual costs remained after these direct and indirect allocations were completed, and these were assigned to the T&D and wholesale units based on a global allocator. The Company's global allocator was based on the revenues, expenses and assets of each of the operating units. Each of these factors was derived by dividing the amount for the operating unit by the total amount for the factor. The global allocator was developed by giving each factor an equal weight and summing the products. Based on these assignments, Holding Company and OSD costs were allocated between T&D and Wholesale/Retail as follows:

	Holding Company Costs (\$000)	OSD Costs (\$000)
Transmission & Distribution	\$1,451	\$52,062
Wholesale/Retail	177	3,999
Total	\$1,628	\$56,061

The Company's presentation was questioned by OPA witness Jim Dittmer, IECG witness Dr. Silkman and in the Advisory Staff's Bench Analysis. The Bench Analysis noted that while divestiture of the generation function will eliminate approximately one-third of the Company's operations, measured by investment, CMP assigned only 4.4 percent of total overheads and 5.3 percent of A&G expenses to the

generation function as a result of the asset sale. Out of a total of 458 administrative employees, the Company has only projected a reduction of 18 positions as a result of divestiture. In addition, the Bench Analysis expressed concern that CMP failed to recognize any costs as allocable to new lines of business that the Company intends to enter, or to subsidiaries that the Company intends to grow. Finally, the Bench Analysis expressed concern with the Company's top-down approach, which looked at the costs that would be eliminated when it left the generation business, rather than what it would cost to run its T&D business.

Based on these concerns, the Bench Analysis presented two alternative methods for allocating CMP's administrative or overhead costs between its T&D and other operations. Both methodologies involved allocating overheads to generation, in addition to T&D and W&R, as a means of projecting the amount of costs which no longer were necessary or which were attributable to CMP's emerging lines of business.

We ultimately rejected all of the methodologies presented. We found the Company's method to be flawed for not properly recognizing the A&G costs associated with the Company's new lines of business. We also found the Bench Analysis's approach to be flawed in that it did not properly recognize the lost economies of scope which would likely occur when the generation function was divested from the integrated electric utility. In coming to our decision on this issue in this case, we noted:

The cost separations issue contains some of the most difficult questions in this case because of the evolutionary nature of the electric industry and of CMP itself. We do not know for certain what the organizational structure of CMP will be or what lines of business outside of T&D the Company will actually pursue. We agree with the Company's assertion that at least during the initial phases of restructuring, many of the Company's current A&G costs will be unavoidable. It is also possible that certain areas will see increasing costs as CMP adjusts to its role as an "intermediary" between customers and suppliers. Finally, the level of CMP's non-core activities remains uncertain, and thus, the portion of costs that should be allocated away from the T&D operations requires informed judgment on our part.

Phase I Order at 14. Using our judgment, we concluded that the test year adjusted A&G costs should be reduced by \$1.9 million, or 4% less than the Company's recommendation.

In its Phase II filing, the Company argues that its A&G costs "will not go away simply because MainePower no longer exists as a business unit," and, therefore, these costs must be picked up by the T&D company. While we are not necessarily convinced that the elimination of MainePower will result in an increase in T&D A&G costs, we agree with the Company that the elimination of MainePower represents a significant

change in CMP's corporate structure. Therefore, we conclude that CMP should be allowed to present its case that this change will increase T&D costs.

Dated at Augusta, Maine, this 29th day of October, 1999.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

Dennis L. Keschl
Administrative Director

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR: Welch
 Nugent
 Diamond

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

1. Reconsideration of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R.110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
2. Appeal of a final decision of the Commission may be taken to the Law Court by filing, within 30 days of the date of the Order, a Notice of Appeal with the Administrative Director of the Commission, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(1)-(4) and the Maine Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 73, et seq.
3. Additional court review of constitutional issues or issues involving the justness or reasonableness of rates may be had by the filing of an appeal with the Law Court, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(5).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.